

## REPORT

ON

## NATIVE PAPERS

FOR THE

Week ending the 15th August 1896.

## CONTENTS:

	Page.		Page.
<b>I.—FOREIGN POLITICS.</b>		<b>(f)—Questions affecting the land—</b>	
The Maharaja of Vizianagram's offer of one lakh ...	787	Nil.	
<b>II.—HOME ADMINISTRATION.</b>		<b>(g)—Railways and communications, including canals and irrigation—</b>	
<b>(a)—Police—</b>		A road in Kanchrapara on the Eastern Bengal State Railway ... ... ... ...	795
Outrage upon women in Barisal ... ... ... ...	ib	A railway complaint ... ... ... ...	ib
A case of suspicious death in the Backergunge district ... ... ... ...	ib	The Lieutenant-Governor on railways and communications in the Dacca district ... ...	796
Rain-gambling ... ... ... ...	ib		
Zamindari oppression in the Bogra district ...	ib		
A case of zamindari oppression in the Faridpur district ... ... ... ...	788		
<b>(b)—Working of the Courts—</b>			
Badmashes in the Khulna district ... ... ... ...	ib		
The Lieutenant-Governor on the detection of crime in Backergunge ... ... ... ...	ib		
<b>(c)—Jails—</b>			
The Pakour case ... ... ... ...	ib		
An additional Judge not wanted in the Calcutta Small Cause Court ... ... ... ...	789		
Mr. Westmacott's interference with judicial independence ... ... ... ...	790		
Mr. Heard ... ... ... ...	ib		
Mr. Douglas, Sessions Judge of Dacca ...	ib		
Babu Mati Lal Haldar, Munsif of Alipore ...	ib		
A Munsif wanted at Govindpur in the Manbhum district ... ... ... ...	ib		
The cost of witnesses ... ... ... ...	791		
The <i>Pioneer</i> on the Calcutta High Court ...	ib		
Mr. Lang, District Magistrate of Hooghly ...	ib		
<b>(d)—Education—</b>			
Poor school-masters in the Education Department ...	792		
Sir Alexander Mackenzie on technical schools ...	793		
<b>(e)—Local Self-Government and Municipal Administration—</b>			
The Lieutenant-Governor on the Dacca Municipality ... ... ... ...	ib		
The Lieutenant-Governor on the proposed taxation for water-supply ... ...	794		
The Calcutta Town Hall question ... ...	ib		
The question of burning-ghat contract in the Baidyabati Municipality ... ...	ib		
Musalmans in self-governing bodies ...	ib		
A defence of the District Engineer of Jalpaiguri ...	ib		
The proposed water-supply taxation ...	795		
The Dacca Municipality ...	ib		
<b>(f)—Questions affecting the land—</b>			
Nil.			
<b>(g)—Railways and communications, including canals and irrigation—</b>			
A road in Kanchrapara on the Eastern Bengal State Railway ... ... ... ...	795		
A railway complaint ... ... ... ...	ib		
The Lieutenant-Governor on railways and communications in the Dacca district ... ...	796		
<b>(h)—General—</b>			
Rai Sarat Chandra Banerji Bahadur, Settlement Officer, Cachar ...	797		
<b>III.—LEGISLATIVE.</b>			
The <i>Indian Daily News</i> on the Indian Members of the Council ...	ib		
The Estate Partition Bill ...	ib		
<b>IV.—NATIVE STATES.</b>			
Nil			
<b>V.—PROSPECTS OF THE CROPS AND CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE.</b>			
Floods in Burdwan ...	799		
<b>VI.—MISCELLANEOUS.</b>			
Sir Alexander Mackenzie as a ruler ...	800		
Sir Alexander Mackenzie and his utterances ...	ib		
The British Government's treatment of the Indian people ...	801		
Sir Alexander Mackenzie and the Musalmans ...	ib		
Kumar Ramesvar Malia's gift ...	ib		
Sir Alexander Mackenzie's attitude towards the Musalmans ...	ib		
The Musalmans and the Congress ...	802		
The Lieutenant-Governor on the Rishra Bakr-id affair ...	ib		
The Lieutenant-Governor's reception at Mymensingh ...	803		
The <i>Pioneer</i> trying a political trick ...	ib		
Mr. Cotton's kindness to his clerks ...	804		
<b>URIA PAPERS.</b>			
Nil.			
<b>ASSAM PAPERS.</b>			
Nil.			

## LIST OF NEWSPAPERS.

No.	Names of Newspapers.	Place of publication.	Reported number of subscribers.	Dates of papers received and examined for the week.	REMARKS.
<b>BENGALI.</b>					
<i>Weekly.</i>					
1	"Banganivasi" ...	Calcutta	5,000		
2	"Bangavasi" ...	Ditto	20,000	8th August, 1896.	Temporarily discontinued from May, 1896.
3	"Hitaishi" ...	Ditto	800	11th ditto.	
4	"Hitavadi" ...	Ditto	About 4,000	7th ditto.	
5	"Mihir-o-Sudhakar" ...	Ditto	2,500	8th ditto.	
6	"Navayuga" ...	Ditto	.....	8th ditto.	
7	"Sahachar" ...	Ditto	About 500	5th ditto.	
8	"Samay" ...	Ditto	3,000	7th ditto.	
9	"Sanjivani" ...	Ditto	3,000	8th ditto.	
10	"Som Prakash" ...	Ditto	800	10th ditto.	
<i>Daily.</i>					
1	"Banga Vidya Prakashika"	Ditto	About 350	6th to 8th and 10th August, 1896.	
2	"Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika."	Ditto	1,000	9th to 13th August, 1896.	
3	"Samvad Irbhakar" ...	Ditto	1,250	13th August, 1896.	
4	"Samvad Purnachandrodaya"	Ditto	200	7th and 10th August, 1896.	
5	"Sulabh Dainik" ...	Ditto	Read by 3,000	7th, 8th, 10th and 12th August, 1896.	
<b>HINDI.</b>					
<i>Weekly.</i>					
1	"Bharat Mitra" ...	Ditto	2,000	6th August, 1896.	
2	"Hindi Bangavasi" ...	Ditto	10,000	10th ditto.	
<i>Daily.</i>					
1	"Dainik Bharat Mitra" ...	Ditto	5,000		
<b>PERSIAN.</b>					
<i>Weekly.</i>					
1	"Hubbul Mateen" ...	Ditto	.....	13th August, 1896.	
<b>URDU.</b>					
<i>Weekly.</i>					
1	"Darussaltanat and Urdu Guide."	Ditto	310	6th ditto	
2	"General and Gauharieshi"	Ditto	330	8th ditto.	
<b>BENGALI.</b>					
<b>BURDWAN DIVISION.</b>					
<i>Fortnightly.</i>					
1	"Bankura Darpan" ...	Bankura	450		
2	"Ulubaria Darpan" ...	Ulubaria	700		
<i>Weekly.</i>					
1	"Burdwan Sanjivani" ...	Burdwan	About 250	4th August, 1896.	
2	"Chinsura Vartavaha" ...	Chinsura	550	9th ditto.	
3	"Education Gazette" ...	Hooghly	1,145	7th ditto.	

No.	Names of Newspapers.	Place of publication.	Reported number of subscribers.	Dates of papers received and examined for the week.	REMARKS.
	<i>Monthly.</i>	<b>PRESIDENCY DIVISION.</b>			
1	"Ghosak" ...	Khulna ...	350		
	<b>BENGALI.</b>				
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Murshidabad Hitaishi" ...	Murshidabad ...	826	5th August, 1896.	
2	"Murshidabad Pratinidhi" ...	Berhampore ...	200		
3	"Pratikar" ...	Ditto ...	603	7th ditto.	
	<b>URIYA.</b>				
	<i>Monthly.</i>	<b>ORISSA DIVISION.</b>			
1	"Brahma" ...	Cuttack ...	160		
2	"Indradhanu" ...	Ditto ...	.....		
3	"Shikshabandhu" ...	Ditto ...	.....		
4	"Utkalprabha" ...	Mayurbhunj ...	.....		
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Sambalpur Hitaishini" ...	Bamra in the Central Provinces.	.....		Only six copies have been issued since the paper was revived in January 1894. Some 200 copies of each issue are said to have been circulated, but no subscribers have been registered. This paper is said to have some circulation in the Division, but the number of subscribers could not be ascertained.
2	"Samvad Vahika" ...	Balasore ...	190		
3	"Uriya and Navasamvad" ...	Ditto ...	309		
4	"Utkal Dipika" ...	Cuttack ...	480		
	<b>HINDI.</b>				
	<i>Monthly.</i>	<b>PATNA DIVISION.</b>			
1	"Bihar Bandhu" ...	Bankipur ...	600	July, 1896.	
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Aryavarta" ...	Dinapur ...	1,000	1st August, 1896.	
	<b>URDU.</b>				
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	"Akhbar-i-Al Punch" ...	Bankipur ...	500		Temporarily discontinued from 15th May, 1896.
2	"Gaya Punch" ...	Gaya ...	400	3rd August, 1896.	
	<b>BENGALI.</b>				
	<i>Weekly.</i>	<b>RAJSHAHI DIVISION.</b>			
1	"Hindu Ranjika" ...	Boalia, Rajshahi ...	195		
2	"Rangpur Dikprakash" ...	Kakina, Rangpur ...	180	5th August, 1896.	
	<b>HINDI.</b>				
	<i>Monthly.</i>				
1	"Darjeeling Mission ke Masik Samachar Patrika."	Darjeeling ...	500	July, 1896.	It is said that 550 copies of the paper are printed each month. Out of this number 150 copies are distributed among the subscribers, and the rest sold to the public at three pies per copy.
	<b>BENGALI.</b>				
	<i>Fortnightly.</i>	<b>DACCA DIVISION.</b>			
1	"Kasipur Nivasi" ...	Kasipur, Barisal ...	244		

No.	Names of Newspapers.	Place of publication.	Reported number of subscribers.	Dates of papers received and examined for the week.	REMARKS.
	<b>BENGALI—coacl'd.</b>	<b>DACCA DIVISION— conctd.</b>			
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	" Charu Mihir "	... Mymensingh ...	900		
2	" Dacca Prakash "	... Dacca ...	2,400	26th July and 9th August 1896.	
3	" Saraswat Patra "	... Do. ...	About 440	8th August, 1896.	
4	" Vikrampur " ...	... Lauhajangha, Dacca ...	240	6th ditto.	
	<b>ENGLISH AND BENGALI.</b>				
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	" Dacca Gazette "	... Dacca ...	500	10th August, 1896.	
	<b>BENGALI.</b>	<b>CHITTAGONG DIVISION.</b>			
	<i>Fortnightly.</i>				
1	" Tripura Prakash "	... Comilla ...	700		
	<i>Weekly.</i>				
1	" Sansodhini " ...	... Chittagong ...	120		
	<b>BENGALI.</b>				
	<i>Fortnightly.</i>				
1	" Paridarshak-o-Srihattavasi "	Sylhet	....	.....	
		<b>ASSAM.</b>			

## I.—FOREIGN POLITICS.

## THE Maharaja of

The Maharaja of Vizianagram's offer of one lakh.

set on foot in this country against the decision of Parliament in the matter. The Indian people would have thanked the Maharaja if his offer had had any chance of bringing them any relief, however, small. But that is not to be. The Government is not likely to accept his offer. The Maharaja knows this too well, and his offer is sure to gain him a reputation for cheap loyalty. But what was the necessity of protesting against the Suakin agitation, and thereby making a parade of morbid loyalty? Those who bid for official favour in this way are the greatest enemies of their country.

SANJIVANI,  
Aug. 8th, 1896.

Vizianagram, observes the *Sanjivani* of the 8th August, has offered a lakh of rupees towards the expenses of the Suakin expedition, by way of protesting against the agitation which has been

against the decision of Parliament in the matter. The Indian people would have thanked the Maharaja if his offer had had any chance of bringing them any relief, however, small. But that is not to be. The Government is not likely to accept his offer. The Maharaja knows this too well, and his offer is sure to gain him a reputation for cheap loyalty. But what was the necessity of protesting against the Suakin agitation, and thereby making a parade of morbid loyalty? Those who bid for official favour in this way are the greatest enemies of their country.

## II.—HOME ADMINISTRATION.

## (a)—Police.

2. A correspondent of the *Dacca Prakash* of the 26th July says, that at Outrage upon women in Barisal. about 10 or 11 P.M., on the 8th June last, when

DACCA PRAKASH,  
July 20th, 1896.

Babu Bamacharan Mukharji, *alias* Manik Mukharji, brother of Babu Ambika Charan Mukharji, of Kasipur, Barisal, was lying in his room with his wife, aged 13 or 14 years, Maheraddi of Chahutpur, Shaik Gagan, Achhimaddi chaukidar, Tachhimaddi and Shaik Bajnu entered the room and forcibly carried away the girl. On the husband raising a hue and cry, Tachhimadi knocked him down and gagged him, and then fled away. The scoundrels took the girl to a hut, to the east of the Kali's temple, near the bridge, on the Ragura canal, and there violated her. Bamacharan's men searched for the girl, but in vain. Towards day-break she was found in a perfectly unconscious state near a tank, to the north of Bamacharan's house. The culprits have been arrested, and an investigation is going on.

It is impossible to believe that such a horrible occurrence could take place under British rule! The correspondent visited Bamacharan's house five days later, and was so horror-struck at what he heard and saw, that, for the time, he felt as if the people of India were living under Nawab Seraj-u-daulah and not under the civilised and all-powerful British Government.

A few days before, a similar outrage had been committed by some *badmashes* upon the wife of one Raichand Chang, of Chahutpur, a village to the south of Kasipur. But Ramchand is poor, and fears the *badmashes*, and the case is hushed up.

3. Referring to the suspicious death of one Binod, a boy of 13 or 14,

A case of suspicious death in the Backergunge district. resident of Ghaneshyampur, in the Backergunge district, whose body was found tied by the neck to a mango tree, by means of a jute plant, the same

DACCA PRAKASH

paper says that, as very suspicious rumours are afloat regarding the occurrence and its first investigation by the police, which has not been successful, the District Superintendent himself should hold a re-investigation, instead of the Inspector, whom it has been decided to send for that purpose.

4. The *Bharat Mitra* of the 6th August is glad that Sir Alexander

Rain-gambling. Mackenzie has directed his attention to the evil of rain-gambling. The action which His Honour has

BHARAT MITRA,  
Aug. 6th, 1896.

taken, fully warrants the belief that the ruinous practice is at last doomed. His Honour has asked the public bodies in Calcutta to tell him what the evil effects of rain-gambling are, and is, himself, privately enquiring into the matter.

5. A correspondent of the *Mihir-o-Sudhakar* of the 8th August draws the

Zamindari oppression in the Bogra district. attention of the authorities to the oppressions and exactions by certain zamindars and their men, in the Bogra district. The men of one of these

MIHIR-O-SUDHAKAR,  
Aug. 8th, 1896.

zamindars committed horrible oppressions on some Musalman raiyats, who sacrificed a cow on the occasion of the late *Bakr-Id*. The zamindars do not hesitate to accept *nuzzurs* from their raiyats when visiting their zamindaris. And owners of petty estates are more high-handed than big zamindars.

MIHIR-O-SUDHAKAR,  
Aug. 8th, 1896.

6. One, Anisar Rahman, writing in the same paper from Jalilpara within the jurisdiction of the Pangsa thana, in the Faridpur district, says that the news of the sacrifice of cows in the village, on the occasion of the *Bakr-Id*

*A case of zamindari oppression in the Faridpur district.* having reached the Pangsa cutcherry of the Narail estate, the Hindu officers, employed there, sent five peons to bring Herajatulla Midha, Tamizuddin Khondkar, Mahmud Chand Miah and Nader Hosain Miah to the cutcherry. The peons, however, took five rupees and told the men to come to the cutcherry the next day. The four men did not come the next day, and a dozen and a half peons were therefore sent out to bring them. But not finding the men at home, the peons beat the members of their families and came away. The four men then made their appearance at the cutcherry and were released on bail. Subsequently they were made to pay a fine of Rs. 250, the first man Rs. 50, the second man Rs. 100 and the third and fourth men each Rs. 50.

MIHIR-O-SUDHAKAR.

7. Another correspondent of the same paper, writing from Senhati in the Khulna district, says that as the District Magistrate has taken no notice of the petition which was submitted to him sometime ago about oppression by *badmashes*, some member of the Bengal Council should ask Government the following questions:—

- (1) Why are houses found on fire every night at Senhati ?
- (2) Why are chaukidars found implicated in dacoity cases ? And why are the accused in such cases not arrested, even when they are staying at home ?
- (3) What is the cause of the failure of the police to arrest criminals in almost every case ?
- (4) Whether the police enquire into the correctness of the death lists which are supplied by the chaukidars, and whether it is necessary or not to make such an enquiry.
- (5) Whether a District Magistrate is bound or not to take action on receiving a list of the names of *badmashes* from village people. And whether such villages have, or have not, the right to know the result of any investigation which is held.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR  
CHANDRIKA,  
Aug. 9th, 1896.

8. It is perfectly true, says the *Dainik-o-Samáchár Chandriká* of the 9th August, that, as the Lieutenant-Governor said, the murder cases in the Backergunge district can be easily detected, and peace established, if the zamindars and talukdars help the police. But the Lieutenant-Governor should remember that innocent people, offering to help the police, often get into scrapes themselves.

(b)—*Working of the Courts.*

HITAVADI,  
Aug. 7th, 1896.

9. The *Hitavadi* of the 7th August writes as follows:—

The Pakour case.

In our last issue we published an account of the death of Dadali Miya from the effects of a thrashing he received from Mr. Lea, Permanent-way Inspector of Pakour. The murder of a native by an Englishman has almost come to be looked upon in this country as an accident, of which it is vain to complain. We shall, by and bye, learn to regard a case of rupture of the spleen in the same light as we regard a case of lightning stroke or of snake-bite. Already we are almost familiarised with it. But as long as the farce of a trial is kept up, fools that we are, we cannot afford to be entirely hopeless in the matter.

A correspondent writes to us on the subject:—

On the 23rd ultimo a special train with the railway authorities as passengers, was expected at 11 A.M. The deceased, Dadali Miya, was a trolley signalman. A trolley proceeds only when a signal at the junction of rails is lowered. The expected special train not having come that day, even long after 11 A.M., and being expected every moment, Dadali Miya was eating his dinner, letting the signals stand. Just at that time Mr. Lea was driving towards Pakour in a trolley. On approaching the village of Rahar, Mr. Lea saw that the signal had not been lowered. He therefore stopped, and his *khalsi* advanced a little further to see whether any train was coming, but could see none. The redoubtable Englishman then proceeded, and coming near the signal gave Dadali Miya

a thrashing, from the effects of which he fell down. Mr. Lea then drove away. The poor signalman was conveyed home where, having lingered unconsciously for some hours, he died the next day.

This Mr. Lea was once before implicated in a dog-killing case at this very place, but was acquitted. His second victim is this black gate-keeper. As there is a law of progress in this world, who shall say that Mr. Lea will not choose a nobler victim next time? But such speculations are idle at present.

On the 24th July last Mr. Lea was released on a bail of Rs. 2,500, and on receipt of the Civil Surgeon's *post-mortem* report on the 27th, the bail was increased to Rs. 5,000.

The case was taken up on the 29th and continued till the 31st. The complainant, who is a very poor man, asked the Court for a pleader to conduct his case, but his prayer was rejected. The defendant is an Englishman, and he has three or four other Englishmen to help him. The Railway Police Inspector, too, is an Englishman. The complainant and his witnesses, on the other hand, are poor and ignorant coolies, who are utterly confounded by the brow-beating of the defendant's party.

It was clearly proved, by the evidence of the complainant's witnesses, that Mr. Lea severely thrashed Dadali Miya, who was a robust man. As the defendant's pleader has some questions to ask the Civil Surgeon, that Officer will come on the 7th August. The evidence of the defendant's witnessess has not yet been taken. The defendant has cited no other witnesses but his own trolly-men, who are all his servants.

Mr. Lea, it is stated, struck Dadali Miya with his hand. So, we must believe that a slap broke the poor man's spleen!

We are, unfortunately, in great difficulties ourselves just at this moment, or we would help the complainant in conducting his case. If any pleader should be generous enough to conduct the poor man's case for him, we can assure him that he shall have his fee. The local public should help the complainant.

The result of the trial can very well be anticipated, but one must not, on that account, relax in one's efforts to get the offender punished.

We shall have, perhaps, to content ourselves with the poor consolation of seeing this case included in Babu Ramgopal Sannyal's fine book on the trial of cases between Europeans and natives. How can oppression be expected to cease in a country where people have not the courage to speak the truth for the benefit of poor and helpless people, like the complainant in the present case? It will not do to find fault only with the system of administering justice.

10. According to the same paper, it is not necessary to keep an additional

Judge in the Calcutta Small Cause Court. The first three Judges of that Court have nothing to do during the greater portion of the working hours, as their day's work is generally finished by noon or 1 P.M. This statement will be borne out by the pleaders of that Court. If anybody goes to that Court after 3 P.M., he will find the Courts of three or four Judges empty.

The number of cases in that Court has decreased of late years, as will appear from the following statements:—

Year.	Number of casses filed.	Year.	Number of cases disposed of.
1882	... 29,553	1885-86	... 33,664
1883	... 26,027	1886-87	... 32,804
1884	... 31,074	1887-88	... 30,023
1885	... 30,644	1888-89	... 27,350
1886	... 29,216	1889-90	... 29,463
1887	... 26,811	1890-91	... 28,713
1888	... 25,097	1891-92	... 28,572
1889	... 26,396	1892-93	... 28,983
1890	... 26,117	1893-94	... 27,498
1891	... 26,054		
1892	... 26,934		
1893	... 25,395		
1894	... 25,943		

This decrease in the number of suits is due, in some measure, to the new law, making suits of a value exceeding 1,000 rupees cognisable by the High Court as well, but more to diminished confidence in the Judges of the Small Cause Court.

HITAVADI,  
Aug. 7th, 1896.

A saving of 1,200 rupees per month can be effected by abolishing the post of Additional Judge in the Small Cause Court, and this saving may be utilized in lightening the work of the Munsifs, which the Lieutenant-Governor himself admits to be too heavy, by the establishment of three new Munsifs.

The writer heard the late Babu Jadunath Roy express the opinion that no additional judge was needed in the Small Cause Court.

HITAVADI,  
Aug. 7th, 1896.

11. The same paper says that Mr. Westmacott's letter to the District Magistrate of Nadia, directing him to call upon his Subordinate Deputy Magistrate, Mr. J. N. Banerji, as well as some Subordinate Honorary Magistrates,

Mr. Westmacott's interference with judicial independence. for an explanation of their disproportionately large number of acquittals, must produce an evil effect. Interference with the judicial independence of Subordinate Magistrates is, by no means, a justifiable act. The Lieutenant-Governor said the other day that it was only young Civilians who interfered with the judicial independence of their subordinates; but this exhibition by an old officer, like Mr. Westmacott, will now certainly fill His Honour's mind with shame, grief and surprise. His Honour should see that the letter can do no harm.

HITAVADI.

12. The same paper says that the dâk which was lost on its way to Karo camp has not yet been recovered. Mr. Heard, therefore, lately sharply reproved his amla and told them that it was owing to them that the matter had come to the notice of this paper. But why does Mr. Heard disquiet himself? He will not be punished under any régime. On the contrary, he may expect promotion for his oppressive acts! Why is he then so hard upon the poor amla?

HITAVADI.

13. The same paper says that many people have heard of the vagaries of Mr. Douglas, Sessions Judge of Dacca. He does not care for the Judges of the Calcutta High Court, and is dead against the jury system. A juror could not attend his Court for unavoidable reasons. He had made an affidavit, in proper time, praying for an order dispensing with his attendance; but to no purpose. Mr. Douglas fined him 100 rupees, and not satisfied with that, expressed his disapproval of the jury system, and remarked that since he had to work with jurors against his wish, he must take care that they attended regularly. Will Government, however, consider that a remark like this is calculated to bring discredit upon the entire English nation?

HITAVADI.

14. A correspondent of the same paper mentions the following instance, to illustrate the way in which Babu Mati Lal Haldar, Munsif of Alipore, is clearing his file. Giribala Dasi instituted a suit in his Court for the recovery of a debt due to her deceased husband. She instituted the suit before obtaining letters of administration, because the claim would be barred by limitation, in the event of any further delay in instituting it. On the day of the hearing, the defendant did not enter his appearance. The plaintiff, therefore, prayed that the case might be adjourned, pending the granting of letters of administration to her by the Judge's Court. The Munsif, however, rejected the prayer, and dismissed the case. On the plaintiff's pleader observing that this would be very hard upon his client, the Munsif said:—"My file is very heavy just at present. I dismiss the case now, but when you make an application for re-trial, after obtaining letters of administration, I will immediately grant it." This method of disposing of cases is certainly convenient to judicial officers, but very costly and inconvenient to litigants.

HITAVADI.

15. Another correspondent of the same paper says that the Subdivisional Officer of Govindapur, in the Manbhum district, tries cases of every description, civil, revenue and criminal. Govindapur is now, probably, the only place in Manbhum where civil suits are tried by a Magistrate. The place has considerably risen in importance, by the opening of railways and discovery of coal mines. Many traders now come to the place for purposes of trade, and many important civil laws have been extended to it. Civil cases, of a complicated nature, are therefore daily increasing in number. The old arrangement can no longer do.

A Munsif wanted at Govindapur in the Manbhum district. Small Cause Court suits have indeed been tried for the last two years at Raghunathpur. But this arrangement is very inconvenient to poor suitors, who

are often unable to conduct cases at such a distance from their homes. Rich people take advantage of this circumstance to ruin poor men, by instituting false suits.

This inconvenience can be removed by posting a Munsif to Govindapur. The cost of doing that will not exceed the present cost, for a Munsif will enable the services of the Sub-Deputy Collector, who now assists the Subdivisional Officer in disposing of civil suits, to be dispensed with.

16. Babu Basanta Kumar Chatterji writes in the same paper from Calcutta that he was summoned to give evidence in a case in the Court of Babu Tarak Chandra Ganguli,

The cost of witnesses. Subdivisional Officer of Munshiganj. The summons was left at his home in the above subdivision. He received intelligence of the service of the summons in a telegram which he received from home. As he got the telegram too late to be able to attend on the date specified in the summons, he wired to the Court praying it to postpone the date fixed for his attendance. The prayer was graciously granted, and he attended on the date to which the hearing of the case was adjourned. On the conclusion of the trial, he asked the Court for a payment of Rs. 9-6 as diet money and the cost of his journey, although, as a matter of fact, he had incurred more expense under those heads. He also asked for a payment of the cost of his telegraphic message to the Court amounting to Rs. 2-5. The Sub-Deputy Collector disallowed the cost of the telegraphic message, but recommended the correspondent to the Subdivisional Officer, Gagan Babu, for a payment of the rest of his claim. Gagan Babu, however, allowed him only a cost of Rs. 2, and on his representing that this would be very hard upon him, got angry. The correspondent did not take the paltry sum which was offered him.

It is very wrong of Government to treat, in this way, the men whom it cites as witnesses. From what he has heard from other people, the correspondent has reasons to think that the treatment which he received is received by many others.

17. The *Sanjivani* of the 8th August writes as follows:—

The Pioneer on the Calcutta High Court. The Calcutta High Court had recently had an occasion to pass strictures on the Settlement Department. Commenting on these strictures, the *Pioneer* observes that the High Court was actuated by vindictiveness in making them. If any native paper had used such abusive language it would have certainly been prosecuted for contempt of Court. But the *Pioneer* is a demi-official paper, and it counts big officials among its contributors. It is quite probable that the writer of the article in question is an official. The paper need not therefore fear anything. It is a pity, however, that the writer has not sense enough to see that our law-makers are not better versed in law than the Judges of the Calcutta High Court, and that it is not at all strange that experienced lawyers like them should find out flaws in the legislative measures, which are the making of Civilian Members of the Legislature. It is great impudence on the part of the *Pioneer* to try to lower the High Court Judges in the public estimation by representing them as vindictive.

18. The *Chinsura Vartavaha* of the 9th August has the following:—

Mr. Lang, District Magistrate of Hooghly. Mr. Lang, the Magistrate of Hooghly, who has, so to speak, the life and property of thousands of people in his keeping, has become unpopular within a very short time. He is, in the first place, in the habit of dismissing complaints, without inquiring into them or calling for evidence. On appeal to the Sessions Judge, however, the Magistrate's decisions are generally upset. But few can afford to pay the cost of an appeal, and so they either put up with the injury, or are forced to take the law into their own hands. This does not certainly speak well for the maintenance of peace and security in the country. An *amla* failed to prepare a report in due time, and the payment of the salaries of the whole body of *amla* was stopped by the Magistrate. Is there anything in the world to justify such conduct on the part of a Magistrate? The way in which the Magistrate conducted himself in the case of Gopinath Methar, is still fresh in the public mind. Lately the Magistrate figured in another case, by giving proofs of a really remarkable sense of justice. On the 31st July, when the Magistrate was riding in the dark, he came upon the net of a bird-catcher.

HITAVADI,  
Aug. 7th, 1896.

SANJIVANI  
Aug. 8th, 1896.

CHINSURA VARTA-  
VAHA,  
Aug. 9th, 1896.

He at once handed over the bird-catcher to the police, and the next day the accused was sentenced to whipping by the trying Deputy Magistrate. Europeans killing natives like birds and beasts are let off on the plea of accidental death. But even accidents, such as the one which came to the notice of the Magistrate are, in the case of a native, serious offences. And this is justice! This is impartial administration of the law! In the bird-catcher's case one Trailokyanath Chakravarti, a lad of twelve or thirteen, who was present on the scene of occurrence, was cited as a witness by the Magistrate. Like a culprit he was kept in *hajat* for several hours without food. The boy was compelled to absent himself from school, and for this he was fined. Is there anything in the law of the country which can justify the confinement of a witness in *hajat*? Who is responsible for this illegal act? If the administrators of the law break it in this way, how is the credit of the Government for justice to be maintained? The Magistrate has also forbidden even pleaders and mukhtars to enter any office under the Revenue Department. This has caused great inconvenience to the public. The Magistrate can, however, rest assured that his orders will be of no avail with those who will be able to grease the hands of the office peons. His orders will press hard only upon honest and poor people.

On the 29th July last the Magistrate leased out, at Rs. 52 a year, the right of selling *pan* and tobacco in the Court compound. The selling of *pan* and tobacco was of great convenience to the Court-going public, and was, at the same time, a source of income to poor people. Mr. Lang has done what no other Magistrate before thought it at all necessary to do.

(d)—*Education.*

SANJIVANI,  
Aug. 8th, 1896.

19. Govinda Chandra Bhattacharyya writes as follows in the *Sanjivani* of the 8th August:—

Poor school-masters in the Education Department. The clerks, the *amla* and the underpaid police Sub-Inspectors have their friends, but there is no one to speak a word on behalf of the poor school-masters. The boy who has prosecuted his studies up to the fourth class in an Entrance school, is found to enter the Government service through patronage and to draw a good pay in the course of time. But the pay of an educated gentleman in the Education Department is Rs. 25 or Rs. 30 a month. These school-masters are underpaid and underfed. They have to beg when they have to marry a daughter, or to build a house, or to tide over an unforeseen difficulty. There are teachers who, like coolies, are paid six, eight, ten, twelve or eighteen rupees a month. They have no prospects of promotion, and their pay is reduced with the income of the schools to which they belong. Is there no one in the country who can feel for these poor people and try to remove their misery? It is impossible for an educated gentleman and family to live on less than fifty, seventy-five or one hundred rupees a month. The small pay drawn by lower class teachers does not enable them to make the two ends meet. We humbly pray the Lieutenant-Governor to take pity on these school-masters who draw a pay of less than thirty rupees a month.

1. It is no good increasing the number of Inspecting Officers. It will be much more advisable to reduce their number, as that will enable the Government to more adequately aid the schools. If the aid to schools be increased, the pay of poor school-masters will, as a matter of course, increase, and they will be enabled to keep life and soul together.

2. The Education Department is the most low-paid Department in the Public Service. The man who was once a teacher on a salary of fifty rupees a month, may be found drawing a pay of Rs. 500 a month as a Deputy Magistrate, whilst the man who was his official superior in the Education Department, may be found rotting on seventy-five rupees a month throughout his life. There are many Professors rotting on Rs. 200 a month, while their pupils, who have entered the Engineering or the Subordinate Judicial or Executive Service, are drawing at the age of 36, five hundred rupees a month. This injustice would not have taken place if the pay in the Education Department had been regulated, as it is in the other Departments of the Public Service. Even clerks, with a smattering of knowledge, draw a pay of Rs. 200 or Rs. 300 a month. It is the Education Department alone which enjoys a monopoly of misery. We pray the Government to give the poor school-masters a sufficiency of food, instead of creating

new highly paid posts, or increasing the pay of teachers who are already drawing Rs. 50, Rs. 75 or Rs. 100 a month. Sir Alfred Croft will earn the gratitude of the poor, underpaid school-masters of Government or aided schools, if he can raise their pay to Rs. 30 a month.

3. The highest pay, in the Education Department, should be fixed at Rs. 500 a month, and the lowest at Rs. 30.

4. There is no need of appointing Deputy Inspectors on Rs. 150 or Rs. 200 a month for the inspection of vernacular schools. They are not well-versed in Bengali, and they should not be expected to properly examine the boys in that subject. All that they do is to examine the school accounts, and ask the boys a few questions. Inspection work will be far better done by inspecting *pandits*.

5. There is no need, also, of maintaining highly paid Inspectors for the inspection of minor schools. The work is most likely to be better done by experienced teachers appointed for that purpose. The Principal of the Sanskrit College does not, most probably, draw a higher pay than Rs. 500 a month. The pay of the Principals of other Colleges, and of the Inspectors, should be fixed at that amount. Which of the two following alternatives is the better, keeping highly paid Inspectors and reducing the aid to schools from, say, Rs. 16 to Rs. 8 a month, or dispensing with these Inspectors and increasing the aid from Rs. 16 to Rs. 32 a month?

6. We have another prayer to make to the authorities. As the employés in the Education Department are poorly paid, the Government will do them a great favour if it allows their children to read free in the Government schools and colleges. Is there no one to bring this matter to the notice of the Government?

20. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika* of the 9th August has the following:—

Sir Alexander Mackenzie on technical schools.

Sir Alexander Mackenzie was perfectly right in what he said in connection with the Mymensingh

*DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR CHANDRIKA,*  
Aug. 9th, 1896.

Technical School. Technical schools will be of no use if they are established everywhere. Sir Charles Elliott was fond of outward show, and hoped thereby to gain a name. He, therefore, advocated the establishment of technical schools throughout the province. But Sir Alexander Mackenzie very rightly pointed out the enormous expenditure that the establishment of a technical school involved, and did not, moreover, see the necessity of a large number of such schools in the province. His Honour plainly told the Mymensingh people that he could make no contribution from the provincial revenue in aid of the Mymensingh technical schools. In fact, the Engineering College at Sibpur is quite sufficient to teach the people of Bengal those industrial arts which require scientific knowledge. And as regards the more common arts which have existed in the country from time immemorial, no one asks for schools and colleges to teach them.

(e)—*Local Self-Government and Municipal Administration.*

21. The *Vikrampur* of the 6th August has the following, with reference

The Lieutenant-Governor on the to the Lieutenant-Governor's strictures on the Dacca Municipality.

*VIKRAMPUR,*  
Aug. 6th, 1896.

Wherever the Lieutenant-Governor is going, he is personally inquiring into the grievances of the people. The free and unrestrained manner in which he is entering into conversation with those who come to see him, is only a proof of his high-mindedness. From the speeches he has delivered in several places, it is quite clear that he is in the habit of critically examining the good and the bad points in every public question that comes to his notice. It will not therefore be wrong to think that he is fairly acquainted with Dacca affairs, but it is a regret that the fault of a few Commissioners of the Dacca Municipality should have led His Honour to hold that the Dacca people were, as a body, unfit for Local Self-Government. It is the District Board which has to do with local self-government, much more than the Municipality. Under these circumstances, it is not quite just to fasten the fault of the Municipality on Local Self-Government, as it is administered in Dacca. We need not, however, fear anything wrong or unjust from Sir Alexander Mackenzie.

BANGAVASI,  
Aug. 8th, 1896.

22. In his reply to the address of the Mymensingh District Board, the Lieutenant-Governor made the following observations: "The organization of water-supply is a thing that does not require to go on for ever. When you have supplied an area adequately with sources of pure water, your capital expenditure on that account ceases, and all that is required in the future is to maintain these sources of water-supply, to keep them clean, and in a state fit for use. Therefore, you ought to remember that expenditure on water-supply will only last for a very limited number of years, and that, when once local areas have become properly equipped, your Union Committees will be able to drop taxation on that account, and realize only what is necessary for the maintenance of the water-supply, and the small sums required for maintaining primary education."

This is very good to hear, observes the *Bangavasi* of the 8th August, commenting on the above. Very much the same thing was said when the road and public works cesses were imposed. But the administration of these two cesses has not been compatible with the professions made at the time of their imposition. This is the reason why the proposal of taxation has caused the people great apprehension. Can any body assure us that no deviation will ever be made from the policy of the proposed taxation, as explained by Sir Alexander MacKenzie?

BANGAVASI.

23. The Hon'ble Babu Surendranath Banerji, the great Congress Leader, observes the same paper, is very sorry that a new The Calcutta Town Hall question. Town Hall will not be built at the expense of the Calcutta Municipality, *i.e.*, at the expense of the rate-payers of Calcutta. It is his impression that if he had had a Town Hall, spacious enough for his purposes, he could have raised India from her degraded position by making long speeches. In fact, he plainly said that, if there had been a large Town Hall, he would have called a monstrous meeting to protest against the Secretary of State's decision in the Suakin question. This is exactly what one should have expected to hear from a Babu patriot. Does not Surendra Babu sit in the Bengal Council as the representative of the rate-payers of Calcutta? And is that the reason that he feels sorry because the money of his constituency has not been spent on the building of a large Town Hall? Such patriotism is not to be met with in any other part of the world.

BANGAVASI.

24. Nothing, observes the same paper, pains the Hindu so much as a tax on the performance of funeral ceremonies. The question of burning *ghāt* contract in the Baidyabati Municipality. But Mammon is the god now, and countless are his worshippers. Even burning *Ghāts* are let out to contractors, who have to pay to Municipalities for the exclusive enjoyment of the right of selling wood and other articles necessary for the funeral ceremony. The Baidyabati Municipality lately resolved to let out the local burning *ghāt* to a contractor, but its decision has been set aside by the Magistrate of Hooghly. It need not be told that the Members of the Baidyabati Municipality are mostly Hindu, while the Magistrate of Hooghly is a stranger and a Christian.

SANJIVANI,  
Aug. 8th, 1896.

25. Referring to the Lieutenant-Governor's reply to the Mymensingh Musalman address, the *Sanjivani* of the 8th August observes as follows:—

Musalmans in self-governing bodies.

From the conduct of the Musalmans in a district in which the Musalman element preponderates, it is quite clear that the allegation that Musalmans are crowded out by Hindus from Municipalities and District and Local Boards is without any foundation. It is want of education, public spirit and self-sacrifice that has to answer for the paucity of Musalmans in these self-governing bodies.

SANJIVANI.

26. A correspondent of the same paper writes as follows in continuation A defence of the District Engineer of what he wrote on the subject in a previous issue:—

It is a false allegation that Gagan Babu is in the habit of patronizing his friends and relatives by accepting their tenders at favourable terms. None of the District Board contractors is related to Gagan Babu in any way. Siva Biswas is no relative of Gagan Babu's, and his wife has no sister. The District Board contractors Panchu and Pratap Haldar, are not, as has been alleged, friends or relatives of the District Engineer. It is true that Gagan Babu is

like all kind-hearted men, in the habit of befriending poor fellow-villagers, but he does this without any prejudice to the interests of the District Board.

Gagan Babu is not in the habit of inspecting tea gardens, and thereby remunerating himself. Many of the district roads lie through, or in the vicinity of, tea plantations. The Engineer's duty makes him pay these roads visits, and in the course of such visits, he inspects the gardens, at his leisure, without any remuneration.

As for the driving of spars of wood into the north bank of the Jaldaka (Report on Native Papers for 18th July 1896, paragraph 19), how can the Officiating Engineer compare the process of driving posts, for the purpose of building a house, with the process of driving spars of wood for the protection of the bank of a river from floods? The Officiating Engineer should devote more time to the discharge of his own duties, than to the discovering of flaws in Gagan Babu's work.

27. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika* of the 9th August has the following:—

The proposed water-supply tax. If Sir Alexander Mackenzie had been the permanent and immortal ruler of Bengal, we could have relied upon his assurances about the character of the water-supply taxation. But four years more and Sir Alexander will cease to be at the head of the Bengal Administration. And then, who shall say that his successor will allow taxes, once imposed, to be abolished? Precedent, at any rate, shows that a tax, once imposed, is never abolished. Income-tax is an illustration in point. It is true the proposed taxes will be imposed, not by Government, but by the Union Committees. But are not Union Committees under the control of Government? And we cannot believe that they will have a free hand in the abolition of the taxes, after they have been imposed. Sir Alexander Mackenzie may think that all his successors will be like himself, but we know better than to indulge in such a dream, and cannot, therefore, accept Sir Alexander's assurance, without fear or misgiving. A marriage tax, in particular, will be extremely troublesome and offensive to Hindus and Musalmans. A wheel-tax may be allowed without much objection. We have also always said that, in pressing necessity, a tax may be imposed on the trades, &c. But we can suffer no ceremony, or institution in any way connected with religion, to be taxed.

28. The *Dacca Gazette* of the 10th August says that those who have read the Lieutenant-Governor's Dacca speech with care

The Dacca Municipality. must have perceived that the Commissioners of the Dacca Municipality have incurred official displeasure, on account of their refusal to increase taxation. The Commissioners' excuse for not increasing the rates is extremely childish. It is undeniably that, as regards sanitation, Dacca is fully a quarter of a century behind any other town in Bengal. The Lieutenant-Governor said Dacca is in no better sanitary condition than he had seen it in 20 years ago.

The sanitation of Dacca must therefore be improved according to modern approved methods. And that cannot be done without money. It is therefore pure folly, on the part of the Commissioners, to refuse to increase taxation, in spite of repeated requests from the authorities. They say that the poor rate-payers will find increased taxation too heavy. But increased taxation will affect rich people more than the poor; and the plea about the poor is really intended to shelter the rich. Poor rate-payers suffer, not so much for high taxation, as for heavy assessments. With a fair assessment, not even increased taxation will be felt as a great hardship by the poor.

(g)—*Railways and communications, including canals and irrigation.*

29. A correspondent of the *Mihir-o-Sudhakar* of the 8th August complains

A road in Kanchrapara on the Eastern Bengal State Railway. of the dilapidated condition of the road in Kanchrapara, on the Eastern Bengal State Railway, which runs westward from the Railway Station. It is completely broken in three or four places.

30. A correspondent of the *Sanjivani* of the 8th August writes as follows:—

A Railway complaint.

On the 30th July last, I and a few friends of mine went to the Sealdah station to see a relative off by the Goaland Mail

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR  
CHANDRIKA,  
Aug. 9th, 1896.

DACCA GAZETTE,  
Aug. 10th, 1896.

MIHIR-O-SUDHAKAR,  
Aug. 8th, 1896.

SANJIVANI,  
Aug. 8th, 1896.

train. He had a ticket for the intermediate-class, but we had to wait in the third-class booking office for the weighing and booking of his luggage. The Railway cooly, No. 102, refused to weigh the luggage if he was not paid eight annas for his service, although we pointed it out to him that it was his clear duty to weigh and carry the luggage to the brake-van. This compelled us to seek the protection of the Railway police. A friend of mine was, after a quarter of an hour's expostulation, permitted by the Railway gateman to go to the platform. A complaint was lodged with the police. A consultation with the Station Master was needed, but that functionary could not be found; so we were obliged to weigh the luggage ourselves. It weighed 2 *maunds* and 30 *seers*. The booking clerk asked me if I wanted him to charge me reduced fare (অবেক্টা ভাবী হইলাছে, কিছু কমাইলা দিব কি?) and I answered in the negative. In handing over the receipt to me, the booking clerk wanted to know where our cooly was. On my answering that we had ourselves weighed the luggage, he called a cooly and told him to label it and carry it to the brake-van. The cooly demanded remuneration, and after a good deal of useless expostulation, we were obliged to satisfy him.

After train time, I went to the Station Master to lodge a complaint. Hearing that the luggage did not belong to me, he ridiculed me and told me that I had no business to lodge the complaint. He then referred me to the Railway police. I went to the police office and was soon followed by the Station Master, who asked the police to let him know what I wanted. Being told that I had a complaint to lodge against the cooly, No. 102, the Station Master said that there were only one hundred coolies in the station. This is, however, not true. The police told me that there were more than one hundred registered coolies in the station. I have brought the matter to the notice of the Traffic Manager, and am awaiting a reply.

31. The *Dacca Prakash* of the 9th August has the following:—

DACCA PRAKASH,  
Aug, 9th 1896.

The Lieutenant-Governor on  
Railways and communications in  
the Dacca district.

In his reply to the address of the Dacca District Board, the Lieutenant-Governor said that that district did not stand in need of a railway. Sir

Alexander Mackenzie came to Dacca during the rainy season, and he saw boats and steamers plying in the rivers. He could not therefore form an idea of the enormous loss which the Dacca people have to suffer on account of there being no railway in that district. The absence of a railway from Goalundo to Dacca is causing the Government a loss of several lakhs of rupees a year. It will not cost the Government more than forty-five lakhs of rupees, including the cost of a bridge on the Dhaleswari, to construct the proposed railway, but the railway, when laid, is sure to yield an income of twenty or twenty-five lakhs of rupees a year. It is owing to there being no railway between Goalundo and Dacca that goods traffic is so small on the Dacca-Mymensingh Railway. If this railway is not constructed, the goods traffic on the Eastern Bengal State Railway is most likely to be diverted, and a serious loss will then be inflicted on that line. Without this railway the purpose of the Assam-Burma Railway is sure to be defeated.

The Lieutenant-Governor used a very strange argument to prove his contention. He said there were great facilities of water-communication in Dacca, and there was therefore, no need of wasting money on the construction of a railway there. It is, with a good deal of hesitation, that we contradict, for the first time, a statement of Sir Alexander Mackenzie's, and we are really very sorry to have to do this. Most of the longest railways have been laid on sea-coasts, or along river-banks. Witness, for example, the East Indian and the East Coast Railways. The proposed Kalna-Katwa Railway, which the East Indian Railway Company are going to construct, with a view to successfully compete with Messrs. Hoare, Miller and Company, is going to be carried along the bank of the Bhagirathi. Costly railways, yielding small profit can be laid on the banks of rivers. But a railway which will not cost much but will yield a large profit, must not be constructed on the bank of a river. The Government, it appears, is resolved not to construct this railway. It will sooner bridge the Bay of Bengal and construct a railway between Calcutta and Chittagong. It has no objection to the construction of the costly Singiya-Madaripur Railway, which is not likely to pay, or to the linking of the Northern Bengal Railway, a losing concern, with the Assam-Bengal Railway, but it will never construct a cheap railway which will pay so much. What a thing is official obstinacy!

Referring to the silting up of the Burigunga, the Lieutenant-Governor observed that it had been going on for years, and it would take the river a long time to return to its original condition. From this it must be understood that the Government will dredge the river little by little. If it took the river thirty years to silt up, it will take the Government the same period to dredge it. It cannot be that the river will, by a natural process, regain its depth. Let us hope that the Lieutenant-Governor did not mean that. No less than fifteen rivers in the Dacca district have silted up, and none of them has regained its depth by a natural process. The Lieutenant-Governor, we are sorry, committed a regrettable blunder in his reply to the address of the Dacca District Board. He came to Dacca in the evening of an inauspicious Thursday, and it was in that inauspicious hour that the address was presented to him. That the Lieutenant-Governor would bungle in Dacca was, therefore, known beforehand. His Honour could not counteract the evil influence of the inauspicious hour.

(h)—General.

32. A correspondent of the *Sanjivani* of the 8th August complains against Rai Sarat Chandra Banerji, Bahadur, Settlement Officer, Cachar. The peons of the settlement offices draw six or seven rupees a month as pay. Living is dear in Cacher, and a peon cannot live on less than five or six rupees a month. They, therefore, used to do menial service to the clerks after office hours, in return for which they got their meals. This was an arrangement, convenient to the clerks, as well as to the peons. But the Settlement Officer has forbidden the peons to serve the clerks. He himself, however, is in the habit of making the office employés serve him. The three peons of the head office serve him without remuneration. The punkha coolies do his gardening, and a clerk superintends his kitchen garden. He occupies the office bungalow and two other rooms as his residence, without, however, paying anything for them.

The Rai Bahadur has invented a novel way of keeping his official superiors in humour. He pays the office employés less than their sanctioned pay, which they do not even get regularly every month. He keeps the offices open even on Sundays and holidays. The settlement offices were kept open during the last Good Friday. If a clerk or office employé applies for leave, he is either dismissed or granted leave without pay. Lately a clerk was ill of fever, and applied for leave and was dismissed. In his place a relative of the Settlement Officer's was appointed. The Settlement officer is very much dissatisfied if a clerk brings his family to live with him.

III.—LEGISLATIVE.

33. It is quite clear to the *Sanjivani* of the 8th August from what the *Indian Daily News* writes by way of apologising to Indian Members of the Bengal Council, that it does not like that questions should be raised in the Council regarding misconduct of European officials, in consequence of which they might be punished. It is quite clear that either the Editor or an official of rank or position tried to stop the mouths of the Indian Members, by circulating a false and damaging rumour against them. Nothing could be meaner than to slander gentlemen for the purpose of accomplishing one's low and selfish ends.

34. The *Dacca Prakash* of the 9th August has the following:—

The Estates Partition Bill. It seems the zamindars of this country have committed innumerable crimes against Government and the Legislature. There is hardly an Act or Regulation affecting the zamindar class, however slightly, which does not contain provisions detrimental to their interests. But the Estates Partition Bill is a piece of legislation which, if passed, will prove simply ruinous to them. Here is a measure which is very likely to deal a death blow to a whole class of people, and yet there is absolutely no reason or justification for it. All that one can find in it is that there is a determination to ruin the zamindars. There is the practice, all over the world, of ruining hostile sovereigns and potentates by means of war. But some reason is always assigned, or justification attempted, even for wars undertaken for such purposes. No plea or justification, however, seems necessary, when it is

SANJIVANI,  
Aug. 8th, 1896.

SANJIVANI,  
Aug. 8th, 1896.

DACCA PRAKASH,  
Aug. 9th, 1896.

proposed to ruin the zamindars, who are Government's own subjects placed under its protection. Really this is matter for wonder under British rule. We shall notice a few provisions of the Estates Partition Bill, which are likely to prove injurious to the zamindars.

Under the Bengal Tenancy Act, it is extremely difficult, nay, almost impossible, for the different co-sharers of an estate to preserve their interests intact. (1) The amount of rent which is received by each co-sharer of a joint undivided estate is very small, and if a suit is brought for the recovery of the money, it is not always possible to realize the costs incurred by the plaintiff. The result is, the rents of joint undivided estates are seldom realized from the raiyats. (2) The existing rents are very low, and were fixed long ago when the price of agricultural produce was low. At the present time, though the prices of crops have increased four to five times, rent remains as low as before, because the co-sharers of an undivided estate cannot, under the Bengal Tenancy, Act, enhance it. (3) The raiyats of a joint undivided estate, being bought over by the proprietors of other estates by money or otherwise, not un-often declare land which is included in such estate, as land appertaining to some one of those estates. By paying only a nominal rent to those proprietors for such land, they help to establish a twelve years' possession in their favour, and do not let the proprietors of the joint undivided estate know that the land in question once formed part of it. The latter, again, owing to mutual jealousy and discord, are never able to get the land re-transferred to their own estate. The Tenancy Act having materially injured their interests as co-sharers of an undivided estate, they are not able to resort to the litigation which alone could help them to rescue their land from the clutches of the usurper. The effect of all this is that the area of joint undivided estates is decreasing day by day, and matters, in not a few such estates, threaten to come to a pass, in which those properties will cease to bring any profit to the zamindars, and enable Government to realize its revenue by means of sale.

It is for the purpose of protecting their own interests from the great injury which, from the causes mentioned above, is being done to joint undivided estates that some co-sharers of such estates seek partition. To refuse them partition, under these circumstances, would be very nearly the same as depriving them of their estates and making a gift of these to proprietors of other estates. As section 116 of the existing Partition Act stands, and sections 10, 32 and 88 of the Bill have been drafted, partition of such estates would be impossible, and it would be simply foolish to apply for partition. Under section 10 of the Bill, no partition would be allowed if separate estate would be liable for land-revenue not exceeding one hundred rupees. Section 32 empowers the Commissioner of the Division to strike a partition case off the file any time he likes. Under section 88, the Collector, the Commissioner, or the Board may, without much difficulty, strike a partition case off the file. But neither in section 32 nor in section 88 (a) has there been specified any such reasonable ground as may justify the Collector or the Commissioner in dealing with a partition case in that way. It is clear that such Officers will be at liberty to strike a partition case off the file, if only they are so minded. Of-course there would have been no objection to their being vested with such powers, if they had been always inclined to act in accordance with justice. But the fact that a Collector's decision is often reversed by a Commissioner, that a Commissioner's decision is frequently set aside by the Board, and that decisions passed by any one of these authorities are upset by the Courts, is enough to convince Government, as well as the public, that the orders passed by the officials in question are, in the great majority of cases, not consonant to justice, but are prompted by whim and caprice.

Is it not gross injustice to empower officials, who are so capricious and whimsical, to cancel partition cases without sufficient cause, and thus to put the proprietor-applicants for partition to the needless expense of thousands of rupees?

The grounds on which a partition case may be struck off the file should be clearly specified in the law, and nothing but danger to the safety of the land-revenue should be considered a sufficient ground for resorting to that extreme step. The provisions of sections 101, 102 and 103 of the Bill will prove sufficient for the purpose of ensuring the safety of the land revenue as regards the separate estates formed by partition. Even if they are deemed insufficient for that

purpose, it may be further laid down that, if the amount of land-revenue, payable on account of such separate estate, cannot be realized by the sale of the estate, the other estates, formed out of the parent estate by partition, will be liable for the amount, notwithstanding the fact that they are separate estates. Some such provision will doubtless secure the safety of the land-revenue. If land appertaining to another estate is included in a separate estate formed by partition, and thus endangers the safety of the land-revenue payable by the former other estate, careful enquiries should be made as to whether such land has been really so included and the safety of the land-revenue thus endangered. It is necessary that, in such cases, the area of the land, so included, should be ascertained from the survey papers. As section 88.c) provides for giving to an estate such land as may be considered to rightfully belong to it, there appears to be no reason why partition should be refused on the ground that by granting it the safety of the land-revenue of such estate would be jeopardized. And if no such ground exists, proviso (II) to sub-section (1) of section 88 becomes perfectly unnecessary. If Collectors are given the discretion to strike partition cases off the file whenever they consider the safety of the land-revenue to be in danger, there can be no partition of an estate at all. For whenever the proprietors of an estate are found to be anxious to secure their interests by means of partition, the proprietors of neighbouring estates, who are desirous of wrongfully annexing land appertaining to that estate, throw obstacles in the way of partition, and such men will not let slip the opportunity afforded them by section 116 of the existing Act or section 88 of the Bill. Even if their unjust claim is dismissed, they have nothing to fear or lose, while if the Collector relying on the false statements of their perjured witnesses should cancel their partition case, the proprietor-applicants for partition would be put to ruinous loss.

As the proprietors of joint undivided estates are, on the one hand, subjected to great loss and inconvenience owing to their inability to get such estates partitioned, so they are, on the other, not unfrequently ruined by their inability to pay the costs of partition. To meet these costs many zamindars have had to sell their estates. This can be proved from the Collectorate records. High officials of Government may consider such costs trifling, and may therefore saddle applicants for partition with the heavy expenses of partition establishments. But, as a matter of fact, these costs prove ruinous to the zamindars. Even if the latter can get the partition prayed for, they may not mind the expense, heavy as it is, but when Collectors and other officers, charged with partition work, capriciously dismiss partition cases, instituted and conducted at so much expense, should not the legislators see what fearful dacoity it is that is committed? You will ruin me by levying from me the costs of partition and yet you will not give me the benefit of partition! Is it not fearful oppression to give such powers to Collectors and Commissioners? What crimes have the zamindars committed that you should compel them to pay the costs of partition, and yet refuse them its benefit? Such encouragement of oppression and downright robbery should not, certainly, be the object of any law whatever. It should be therefore laid down that the estate must be partitioned, the costs for whose partition have been levied. It is not proper that partition cases should be allowed to be struck off the file, under section 116 of the existing Act, or section 88 of the Bill. Only the disputed land should be allowed to remain part of the joint estate, pending the decision of the Civil Court, and all other land of the estate should be admitted to partition.

#### V.—PROSPECTS OF THE CROPS AND CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE.

##### 35. The *Burdwan Sanjivani* of the 4th August writes as follows:—

BURDWAN SANJIVANI.  
Aug. 4th, 1896.

Floods in Burdwan. The Government destroyed the embankment on the right bank of the Damodar, with the view of saving the villages on that bank of the river from inundation, but in vain. Is there no escape for these unfortunate poor people? Will they have to suffer from year to year from the floods? The English have achieved many great things, but can they not save the people from the Damodar floods? We pray the Lieutenant-Governor to personally inquire into the grievances of the people and take steps to remedy them.

## VI.—MISCELLANEOUS.

SAHACHAR,  
Aug. 5th, 1896.

36. The *Sahachar* of the 5th August has the following:—  
Sir Alexander Mackenzie as a ruler. Bengal, Madras and the North-Western Provinces are just now enjoying great good fortune. For Bengal has got Sir Alexander Mackenzie,

Madras, Sir Henry Havelock, and the North-Western Provinces, Sir Antony MacDonnell. If sumptuous and pompous displays could make an administration a success and a Governor popular, Lord Lytton would have had the first claim to be considered the most popular ruler that India has ever seen; for his Delhi Darbar outshone, in grandeur and splendour, any display of the kind held by any other Governor-General. To win the love and loyalty of a subject people, a ruler must know how to sympathize with them, in their joys, as well as in their sorrows. Lord Ripon sympathized with his subjects, and did his best to remove their wants and grievances. He did not, it is true, always succeed in that. But his good intentions and sympathy with the people often made the latter worship him as a god, and secured him a cherished place in their hearts. Indians are, in fact, never annoyed with their Sovereign, until their patience is completely worn out.

Sir Alexander Mackenzie is a ruler who can sympathize with his people. And his sympathy is not mere lip-sympathy. He does what he says he will do. His people, therefore, already place perfect confidence in him.

His statement of the object of gubernatorial tours, in his Rajshahi speech, proves him a perfect master in the art of statesmanship. The ruler who can keep himself in kindly touch with his people and maintain cordial relations with his subordinates, is sure to be popular and successful. Sir Ashley Eden kept these two points in view in ruling the province, and he earned the reputation of one of the best rulers Bengal had ever seen. Sir Alexander Mackenzie learned the secret of the art of government at the feet of Sir Ashley, and there can be no doubt that he will earn his master's popularity and reputation, if he follows in his footsteps.

MURSHIDABAD  
HITAISHI,  
Aug. 5th, 1896.

37. The *Murshidabad Hitaishi* of the 5th August writes as follows:—

Sir Alexander Mackenzie and his utterances. The assurances which Sir Alexander Mackenzie has given to the people of Bengal, in the course of his mufassal tour, are an augury of happy days for

the province. It is not every Lieutenant-Governor from whom the Bengalis hear even words of mouth so assuring. Unlike his predecessors, Sir Alexander Mackenzie does not deprecate agitation. He is doing his best to encourage the people, and to help them. He wishes to create good feelings between the Sovereign and the subject. He is evincing the greatest interest in the improvement of Municipalities and District Boards; and it is natural that he should, for he was one of the principal advocates of Local Self-Government, when it was introduced under Lord Ripon, and it was owing to him that the Local Self-Government Rules were drawn up. Indeed, measures conducive to the welfare of the country are likely to be carried out better by local self-governing bodies than by *khairkhan* officials and Government nominees. The Lieutenant-Governor highly praised the rate-payers of the towns in which attempts are being made to introduce water-works and drainage, but, like a really noble-minded ruler, did not give his assent to proposals to impose improper taxes to meet their cost. We agree with His Honour that there can be no improved sanitation without water-supply and drainage, undertaken at one and the same time. Water-works, without drainage, are more likely to be injurious to health than otherwise.

Prayers for railway extension have not been summarily rejected by Sir Alexander Mackenzie, as they were by his predecessors, and people who have made such prayers, have been told that His Honour will carefully consider them.

His Honour is a friend of high education. He has advised the people of those places in which high education has languished, for want of private support in the shape of scholarships, &c., to take better care of it in future, and has told the Musalmans to try to make greater progress in education. He is to be specially thanked for the assurance he has given that he will treat Hindus and Musalmans impartially. Such treatment will soon put a stop to those quarrels

between the two peoples, which were the result of Sir Charles Elliott's exhibition of undue partiality to the Musalmans. We should like to see an improvement in the position of Musalmans, but we cannot support their unfair claim to have precedence over more competent Hindus in the public service.

In reference to the proposed water-supply taxation, His Honour said that he would not attempt to impose taxes to which the educated people of the country were opposed. Words, so noble, never fell from the mouth of any other Lieutenant-Governor. Many other Lieutenant-Governors did us great harm out of their *zid* for their own prestige. The present Lieutenant-Governor has consulted the High Court about the extension of the jury system, but Sir Charles Elliott wanted to abolish the system altogether.

If Sir Alexander Mackenzie's assurances are fulfilled, his will be a model rule in Bengal, which will be the best and most lasting monument of his fame.

38. The *Darussultanat and Urdu Guide* of the 6th August says that it

The British Government's treatment of the Indian people.

is useless for the Indian people to protest against any action of the Home Government in connection with Indian affairs. The Indian people duly criticized

DARUSSALTANAT  
AND URDU GUIDE,  
Aug. 6th, 1896.

the proposal of the Home authorities for the payment of the cost of the Indian contingent, sent out to Suakin, from the Indian Exchequer. But they have been silenced by the statement that, as the Suakin expedition has been undertaken especially for the benefit of India, it is her duty to bear the expenses of the troops sent out for the operations. The Muhammadans of Ceylon petitioned the British Parliament against the dismissal of Mr. LeMesurier, a servant of 20 years' standing, for his adoption of Islam. A question in this matter having been asked in the House of Commons, the reply was given that Mr. LeMesurier's betrothal to a Muhammadan girl, when his lawful wife was living, had disqualified him for the public service, a reply which has given the Muhammadans reason to believe that the English entertain antipathy against non-Christian peoples.

39. The same paper says that Sir Alexander Mackenzie's reply to the

Sir Alexander Mackenzie and the Musalmans.

appeal of the Muhammadan Reform Association against the partiality shown by Mr. Lister to the

DARUSSALTANA  
AND URDU GUIDE.

Hindus in the Rishra cow-killing affair, has greatly disappointed the Muhammadan community. As for the Muhammadans' claim to a fair share of the public service, His Honour said that, in filling up vacancies, special consideration would be shown to Muhammadan candidates, but immediately after, he declared the Musalmans ineligible for judicial service. The Muhammadans of Bhagalpur and Dacca presented their addresses to him, with the deference due to the ruler of Bengal, but the replies which they obtained were harsh. For many years Government has shown no confidence in the fidelity of its Musalman subjects, because, in the beginning of its rule, they called the English *Kafirs* and abstained from entering their service. The Musalmans believed that to learn English amounted to apostacy, a belief which has been held by the Musalmans from generation to generation. Surely Government cannot help getting avenged upon them.

Sir Alexander Mackenzie's predecessors outwitted the Musalmans by skilful stratagems. But Sir Alexander Mackenzie is a plain-speaking ruler, and he, therefore, said that the Musalmans should be held incompetent for the judicial service, if they did not learn Bengali.

40. A correspondent of the *Hitavadi* of the 7th August says that the

Kumar Ramesvar Malia's gift.

tenants of Kumar Ramesvar Malia of Searssole are not delighted to learn that he has made a gift

HITAVADI,  
Aug. 7th, 1896.

Rs. 20,000 for the establishment of a hospital for animals at Howrah. They cannot now help feeling themselves worse than beasts, for they find a landlord concerning himself about beasts who would pay no heed to their repeated prayers for roads and drinking water. A fourth part of the amount, which the Kumar has granted for the relief of animals, would have done immense benefit to his poor tenants.

41. The *General and Gouhari Asfi* of the 8th August says that the unsympathetic tone in which Sir Alexander Mackenzie

Sir Alexander Mackenzie's attitude towards the Musalmans.

spoke to the Musalmans during his visit to Gaya, was at first attributed to his displeasure with them

GENERAL AND  
GAUHARI ASFI,  
Aug. 8th, 1896.

for their taking part in the Bihar separation question, a movement first suggested by the *Pioneer*, perhaps, under instructions from Sir Antony MacDonnell, who had a keen hope that the separation of Bihar from Bengal would result in its amalgamation with the North-Western Provinces. But Sir Alexander Mackenzie's Monghyr speech disabused the Musalmans of that idea, and showed them that the present Lieutenant-Governor is not favourably disposed towards the Musalmans. Under Sir Alexander Mackenzie's rule, therefore, the Musalmans will not prosper.

42. The *Mihir-o-Sudhakar* of the 8th August writes as follows:—

**The Musalmans and the Congress.** Congressists are often heard to ask why the Musalmans do not join the Congress. Well, one reason is, that Musalmans do not believe it possible for the Congress to establish unity among the whole Indian population, when it cannot establish unity among the Hindus alone. Not to speak of the Hindus of the other Provinces, the Bengali-Hindus alone are divided among themselves. Even the few newspapers of Bengal, which were known to be the supporters of the Congress, have now fallen out among themselves. The *Hitavadi* is waging war with the *Sanjivani*, and the *Hitavadi* and Babu Surendranath's *Bengali* are waging war with the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*. Is this a sample and specimen of the unity which the young deliverers of India want to establish ?

It is a matter of regret that all this has not yet brought the Congressists to their senses, and they should yet seek to secure the Musalman help. Do they want the Musalmans to come to the Congress, in order that they may have a free fight with them ? That will, indeed, be the perfection of National unity !

43. In reference to the Lieutenant-Governor's reply to the representation

**The Lieutenant-Governor on the Rishra Bakr-id affair.** of the Calcutta Muhammadan Reform Association, on the *Bakr-id* affair in Rishra, the same paper writes as follows:—

It is rather surprising that the Magistrate did not consider it necessary to take any evidence on behalf of the Musalmans, when he was once convinced that there had been no cow-slaughter in the place before. The Lieutenant-Governor said that the Magistrate did not find time to examine the two Musalman witnesses, because he was busily engaged in the bazar in preventing a riot. But was not this a strange proceeding on the part of the Magistrate ? He was placing countless Musalmans in police custody, without hearing them in their defence, whilst the criminal laws require a Magistrate to hear both the complainant and the accused, before passing any order against the latter. It is true, the action of the Magistrate averted a riot, but it interfered with the religion of the Musalmans, and did them a great injustice. The Magistrate did not examine both Hindu and Musalman witnesses, in order to determine whether cow-slaughter might, or might not, be allowed in the place ; he simply wanted to know whether cows had ever before been slaughtered there, and he made this enquiry of the Hindus alone.

Supposing there was no cow-slaughter in Rishra before, on account of there having been no Musalman residents there, was it just and lawful to prohibit cow-slaughter now, when the place had received many Musalman settlers on account of the newly-started mills ? Cow-slaughter is no new institution among the Musalmans ; it is as old as their religion. The Musalmans of Rishra cannot, therefore, be said to have proposed to sacrifice a cow with the object of wounding Hindu feeling. They were bound to perform cow-slaughter ; and they ought to have had full liberty to do so, no matter whether cows had ever before been slaughtered in the place where they were dwelling. To prevent them in the performance of such practices, for fear of a possible breach of the peace, is not just. A logical consequence of the policy, which Government followed in Rishra, would be a prohibition of all trade in pigs by Europeans in Hindu or Muhammadan villages. Has Government ever made such a prohibition ? If Government persists in its policy, the followers of every religion will henceforward have to depend upon the followers of every other for permission to perform their religious practices, and Musalmans, living in Hindu villages, will have to perform their religious practices according to the dictation of their Hind fellow-villagers. If the Hindu takes exception to the *ajan* or the *namaz*, the practice must be at once stopped. The authorities will not, in that case,

listen to anything Musalmans may have to say. And all Musalman observances will be gradually abolished.

One meaning of Government's action in Rishra is, that neither Musalmans nor Hindus should settle in villages in which no co-religionists of theirs ever dwelt before, for, if they did so, they would not be allowed to observe their religious practices. But who shall say how dreadful the consequences of enforcing such a rule must be?

A Muhammadan commits more sin by seeing an idol, than a Hindu does by seeing cow-slaughter. But have the Musalmans ever prohibited the Hindus from worshipping the images of their gods? All that the Musalmans do in order to avoid the sin of seeing a Hindu idol, is that they avoid the places where such idols are worshipped. Cannot the Hindus do the same thing in regard to the Muhammadans' cow-slaughter?

The object of Government in prohibiting cow-slaughter in Rishra is not yet perfectly clear, and seems involved in a kind of mystery. But as Mr. Lister acted under the orders of his superiors, no blame can attach to him.

44. The *Dacca Prakash* of the 9th August is sorry to understand that there were no officials present at the Mymensingh Railway Station to receive the Lieutenant-Governor.

The Lieutenant-Governor's re-ception at Mymensingh. The breakfast arrangements at the Station for His Honour were not satisfactory. The conduct of the Mymensingh officials has struck the public as strange, and whispers are heard in this connection.

45. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika* of the 11th August has the following:—

The *Pioneer* trying a political trick. The *Pioneer* is trying its best to ignore water-scarcity in Bengal. It says that there is a shortness of the supply of water in Bengal during the summer, but the difficulty is removed as soon as the rainy season sets in. There is, therefore, in its opinion, no need of making preparations for the improvement of water-supply. But the *Pioneer* is not right. Water-scarcity did not exist in Bengal before. In those days, tanks were deep and contained water all the year round. Old tanks were repaired and new tanks were dug. That is not, however, the case at present. Water-scarcity is felt as soon as the rainy season ends. In places there is want of water even during that season. There must be some remedy forthcoming for this evil.

Sir Charles Elliott was ever anxious to improve the drainage system, but he paid no attention to the improvement of water-supply in Bengal. Sir Alexander Mackenzie is trying his best to do this, and for this the *Pioneer* is really very sorry. That Anglo-Indian paper evidently thinks the Bengal water agitation not worth a moment's consideration. It seems also to be its secret motive to excite Bengali antipathy against their new ruler. The *Pioneer* has no admiration for Sir Alexander, because he loves the Bengalis, because he is not a bad ruler like Sir Charles Elliott—because, in short, he does not treat the subject-people as cats and dogs. For similar reasons the *Pioneer* has no admiration for Sir Antony MacDonnell, and it is its best endeavour to undermine the sympathy of the people of Bengal and the North-Western Provinces with their respective rulers.

But the *Pioneer's* tricks are not likely to tell. There is, we can assure him, a mutual confidence and understanding between the Bengali's and their ruler. It is the belief of the Bengal people that the Lieutenant-Governor is their well-wisher. They know that he will never, like Sir Charles Elliott, do any harm to Bengal and her people. He may commit blunders. But blunders can be mended. Sir Alexander Mackenzie is sure of the loyalty of the Bengalis. He can understand that, if they agitate and protest, it is for the good of the Government, as well as of the people that they do so. They, too, may commit blunders, but their blunders, too, can be rectified. They are quite willing to have their mistakes rectified, just as they would correct the mistakes of their ruler. These friendly relations are not going to be strained. There is no likelihood of there being a chronic discontent in Bengal during Sir Alexander Mackenzie's rule. This is the prevailing impression in the public mind in Bengal, and nothing the *Pioneer* may say or do will remove it.

DACCA PRAKASH,  
Aug. 9th, 1896.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR  
CHANDRIKA,  
Aug. 11th, 1896.

SULABH DAINIK,  
Aug. 12th, 1896.

46. The *Sulabh Dainik* of the 12th August is glad to learn from a Simla correspondent that Mr. Cotton, as the Home Secretary, has earned the gratitude of his office staff by his kind treatment of them. Mr. Cotton has always been known for his kind and considerate treatment of his clerks and office subordinates, and he has now given further proof of his sympathy with them. With his clerks, we are very glad to see a Bengal Civilian once again at the head of a Department in the Imperial Service.

CHUNDER NATH BOSE,

*Bengali Translator.*

BENGALI TRANSLATOR'S OFFICE,  
The 15th August 1896.